

REMARKS

Claims 1-8 are pending in this application.

Applicants appreciate the courtesies shown to Applicants' representative by Examiner Shankar in the August 30, 2007 personal interview. As agreed at the personal interview, the claims distinguish over Hogle. Applicants' separate record of the substance of the interview is incorporated into the following remarks.

I. Provisional Double Patenting Rejection

The Office Action provisionally rejects claims 1-8 under the doctrine of non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting over claims 1, 10-17 and 22 of U.S. Patent application 10/015642 to Baudisch et al. (Baudisch '642).

Filed herewith is a Terminal Disclaimer rendering the provisional rejection moot. Applicants request withdrawal of the provisional rejection.

II. The Claims Are Patentable Over The Applied Reference

The Office Action rejects claims 1-8 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over U.S. Patent No. 5,923,307 to Hogle IV (Hogle). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Hogle is directed to managing monitor screen displays in a multiple monitor environment. Hogle's invention is directed to USER, a reconfiguration method that (1) arranges the monitor spaces to form a continuous non-overlapping display space at boot time and thereafter anytime there is a geometry change of the monitors; and (2) after a display space change, manages windows or other display regions to "avoid end-user astonishment" (col. 10, lines 24-35). Hogle is silent as to what USER would do if an image spans two or more monitors, and the display resolution of one monitor is changed. However, Hogle discloses that if a window A spans two monitors, initially side-by-side, and the monitors are placed one above the other, USER will force the window A to be wholly within one of the monitor spaces (Figs. 16(a)-16(c); col. 17, lines 9-26), to avoid user confusion.

In the background section, cited by the Office Action, Hogle discloses that a window C can be displayed across two monitors (Fig. 4; col. 1, lines 62-67). Hogle is silent as to the relative display resolutions of the two monitors in Fig. 4 and is silent regarding any difference in the scaling factor applied to the portions of window C in Fig. 4.

Regarding independent claim 1, Hogle fails to disclose "[1] providing first and second portions of the source image to be displayed on the first and second display areas respectively wherein the second portion of the source image is a scaled portion of the source image such that when the first and second portions of the source images are displayed on the first and second display areas the resulting displayed image appears substantially continuous to a viewer situated to view the displayed image and [2] the displayed resolution of the first portion of the source image is different from the displayed resolution of the second portion of the source image."

Regarding feature [1] above, the Office Action cites to Fig. 4 and to col. 1, line 53 to col. 2, line 8 as disclosing the first and second portions of a source image displayed on first and second display areas, the second portion being scaled from the source image.

However, in citing to the prior art embodiment of Fig. 4, showing window C spanning two monitors, and the embodiment of Figs. 11(a)-11(c), illustrating a change of monitor resolution without any image spanning two monitors, the Office Action is attempting to combine two separate teachings. Because the rejection is under 35 U.S.C. §102(b), and because a *prima facie* case of obviousness has been made, the proposed combination is improper.

Regarding feature [2] above, the Office Action cites to col. 3, lines 14-33 and col. 11, lines 48-59 as disclosing different resolutions for two portions of a source image. However, col. 3, lines 14-33 does not state that any image is displayed across two monitor spaces with different resolutions in each monitor space. The second cited section of col. 11, lines 48-59

references Figs. 11(a)-11(c) showing the change in resolution of GUI windows. Figs. 11(a)-11(c) do not show any graphical object spanning two or more monitors. Thus, the allegation that an image spanning two monitors would be maintained after a change in the resolution of either display is mere speculation.

Still further, while Hogle does not discuss what occurs to a graphical window spanning two monitors when a display resolution is made to one monitor, Hogle does discuss what is done when a window A spans two monitors that are initially side-by-side and later are put one on top of the other (Figs. 16(a)-16(c)). In this case, as discussed above, Hogle discloses that USER forces the window A into one of the monitor spaces to the exclusion of the other (Figs. 16(a)-16(c); col. 17, lines 9-26). Because Hogle discloses that a window A, initially spanning two monitors, is moved by USER into the monitor space of one monitor when the physical relationship between the monitors is disturbed, it would appear probable that USER would move a graphical window spanning two monitors into the monitor space of one of the monitors if the graphical resolution of one of the monitors was changed. Thus, further, it is not inherent that USER would alter the relative display sizes of portions of an image spanning two monitors of different resolutions.

Regarding independent claim 4, Hogle fails to disclose "providing n portions of the source image to be displayed on the n display areas wherein at least one of the n images is a scaled portion of the source image such that when the n portions are displayed on the n display areas the resulting image appears substantially continuous to a viewer situated to view the image and the displayed resolution of at least one portion of the source image is different from the displayed resolution of at least one other portion of the source image." Claim 4 is patentable for the same reasons as claim 1 is patentable.

Regarding independent claim 7, Hogle fails to disclose "capturing a second video image to be displayed on the second display area wherein the second image is a scaled portion

of the first image such that when the images are displayed on the first and second display areas the resulting displayed image appears substantially continuous to a viewer situated to view the image and the displayed resolution of the first video image is different from the displayed resolution of the second video image."

Claim 7 is patentable for the same reasons claim 1 is patentable and is further patentable because Hogle fails to disclose any video signals spanning two or more monitor spaces or how USER would handle video signals spanning two or more monitor spaces.

Regarding independent claim 8, Hogle fails to disclose "providing n portions of the source image to be displayed on the n display areas wherein each of the n portions of the source image is scaled using a scaling factor and the scaling factor of at least one of the n portions of the source image is different than the scaling factor of at least one other of the n portions of the source image such that when the n portions of the source image are displayed on the n display areas the resulting displayed image appears substantially continuous to a viewer situated to view the image and the displayed resolution of at least one portion of the source image is different from the displayed resolution of the at least one other portion of the source image." Claim 8 is patentable for the same reasons claim 1 is patentable.

III. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Jonathan H. Backenstose
Registration No. 47,399

JAO:JHB/cxt

Attachment:
Terminal Disclaimer

Date: September 5, 2007

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--